

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 9-20 are cancelled. Claims 1-8 and 21-48 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 21-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menez (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0115606) in view Zenoni (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034873) and Sakamoto (Japanese Publication No. JP 09-162821). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 1, 5, 21, 25, 29, and 33 have each been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Figs. 1-3 and pages 17, 19-20, 25, 28, and 30-31 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

a transaction content providing unit that provides transaction content for transmission to the receiver over a second broadcast channel, the transaction content including a plurality of templates, at least some of the plurality of templates corresponding to various transaction types, the transaction content further including a plurality of replacement information incidental to the associated program content of each one of the plurality of first broadcast channels[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest transaction content including a plurality of replacement information incidental to an associated program content of each one of a plurality of first broadcast channels.

Amended claim 1 further calls for:

a trigger content providing unit that provides associated trigger content that serves as a trigger for reproducing a portion of the transaction content in the receiver, the trigger content including a program to be executed in response to the associated trigger content being triggered, one or more identifiers respectively associated with at least one of one or more of the plurality of templates or one or more of the plurality of replacement information for insertion into the one or more of the plurality of templates[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest trigger content including a program to be executed in response to the associated trigger content being triggered.

Amended claim 1 also calls for:

(b) when the associated trigger content is triggered by a user while the receiver is receiving the program content associated with the selected one of the plurality of first broadcast channels, (i) switches from receiving over the selected one of the plurality of first broadcast channels to receiving over the second broadcast channel in response to the triggering of the trigger content, (ii) extracts the program to be executed and the one or more identifiers from the associated trigger content, (iii) performs processing using the extracted program, (iv) receives the transaction content provided by the transaction content providing apparatus over the second broadcast channel, (v) extracts from the received transaction content the one or more templates, and the one or more replacement information associated with the identifiers included in the associated trigger content, and (vi) causes reproduction of at least some of the transaction content based on the extracted templates and the extracted replacement information[.]

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest extracting a program to be executed from associated trigger content. Moreover, neither the relied

on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto disclose or suggest performing processing using an extracted program (extracted from associated trigger content).

It follows, for at least these reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Menez, the relied on sections of Zenoni, nor the relied on sections of Sakamoto, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the combination set out in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of the references.

Independent claims 5, 21, 25, 29, and 33 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpts of claim 1 and are therefore each patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of Menez, Zenoni, and Sakamoto at least for the same reasons.

Claims 2, 4 and 37-38 depend from claim 1; claims 6, 8, and 39-40 depend from claim 5; claims 22, 24 and 41-42 depend from claim 21; claims 26, 28, and 43-44 depend from claim 25; claims 30, 32, and 45-46 depend from claim 29; and claims 34, 36, and 47-48 depend from claim 33. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Claims 3, 7, 23, 27, 31, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menez in view of Zenoni and Sakamoto and further in view of Cook (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0018966). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, claim 7 depends from claim 5, claim 23 depends from claim 21, claim 27 from claim 25, claim 31 depends from claim 29, and claim 35 depends from claim 33. Therefore, each of the claims is distinguishable over

the relied-on sections of Menez, Zenoni, and Sakamoto for at least the same reasons.

The relied-on sections of Cook do not overcome the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Menez, Zenoni, and Sakamoto.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant